



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,239	09/08/2000	Loren G. Knutson	068520.0103	3004
7590	03/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Baker Botts LLP 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			SHRADER, LAWRENCE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	
			DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

12

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/658,239	KNUTSON ET AL.
	Examiner Lawrence Shrader	Art Unit 2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date #11, 1/08/04. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on January 8, 2004.

Specification

2. The objection made in the prior Office Action regarding the use of USPTO Form 1449 for the cited references is withdraw in view of the "Supplement to Information Disclosure Statement Filed 11/06/2000" received on January 8, 2004 as paper #11 and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The specification objection made in the prior office action is withdrawn in view of the amendment to claims 1 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made..

5. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 10; 11 – 16, and 18 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fowlow et al., U.S. Patent 6,083,277 in view of Reger, U.S. Patent 6,643,843.

In regard to claim 1:

“Providing a set of predetermined function definitions...” Fowlow discloses a set of predetermined functions wherein component A is different from other components B, C, etc. (e.g., see Figure 3) because each component has distinct operations, arguments, attributes, etc. In light of the 35 USC § 112 rejection above, the term “different” is taken herein to mean that each component has distinct functional features.

“Preparing a project definition...” Fowlow discloses a means to prepare a distributed object application (project definition) by connecting distinct components (Abstract) having different function definitions (e.g., see Figure 3).

“A plurality...” Fowlow discloses a plurality of function portions comprised of components having methods performing specific predetermined functions, having an input port and an output port (by which information is obtained and sent) related by the corresponding function definition (Abstract; column 2, lines 1 – 30; e.g., Figure 3). An interface defines a protocol of behavior (predetermined functions) with a set of constant and method definitions contained within an interface that can be implemented by any class anywhere in the class hierarchy. When a class implements an interface, the class agrees to implement all the methods (a function portion corresponding to a function definition) defined in the interface.

“A further portion...” Fowlow discloses that the interface is retrieved to determine the both the destination portion (plugs) and the source portion (sockets), as well as the input and output ports through which the data is supplied and produced (Abstract; column 2, lines 1 – 60; e.g., Figure 3).

“Binding information...” Information is processed and an input is associated with a respective output wherein Fowlow discloses that the interface is retrieved to determine the both

the destination portion (plugs) and the source portion (sockets), as well as the input and output ports through which the data is supplied and produced (Abstract; column 2, lines 1 – 60; e.g., Figures 4 and 5).

“Transmitting through a communications link...a communication from a user...which causes one of storing and execution of the project definition at said second end of the communications link” Transmitting “a communication” could be as simple as a user on one end of the communication link sending a primitive signal to a user or process on the other end of the communication link wherein the signal has a predetermined meaning causing the receiving user or process to store and execute the program (project definition is interpreted as a computer program, because if it is executed on a computer it must have some programmatic structure or a series of commands). Fowlow discloses connections links between components causing storing and execution of a definition (described in the interface of the object component; Abstract, e.g., Figures 4 and 5). Also, Fowlow discloses that the system optionally may be coupled to a computer or telecommunications network using a network connection, but does not explicitly disclose a communication causing storing and execution of a program on the second end of the communication link. However, Reger explicitly discloses a method to download software code through a communication link from a user at a first end to a second end, and the transmission causes automatic storing and execution of the downloaded code in the receiving system (column 5, lines 50 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of preparing a predetermined set of definitions Fowlow with the storing and execution of a program over a communication link as taught by Reger, because the automatic storing and execution of code into a remote system would allow

the coupling of the Fowlow system to a network for downloading updates free of human intervention and without the need for technical expertise as taught by Reger in the Abstract.

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...wherein said preparing step is carried out at said first end of said communications links...” Fowlow discloses that the system optionally may be coupled to a computer or telecommunications network using a network connection. With such a network connection, it is contemplated that the CPU would receive information from the network, or might output information to the network in the course of performing the above-described method steps (column 18, lines 47 – 55; e.g., Figure 10).

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“..including the step of configuring said communications link to include a network.” Fowlow discloses that the system optionally may be coupled to a computer or telecommunications network using a network connection. With such a network connection, it is contemplated that the CPU might receive information from the network, or might output information to the network in the course of performing the above-described method steps (column 18, lines 47 – 55; e.g., Figure 10).

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 3:

“...to include a portion of the Internet.” Fowlow discloses protocols allowing the network to include the Internet (column 5, lines 26 – 36).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...said first and second ends of said communications link to be physically remote locations.” Fowlow discloses a system directed towards a distributed system, including CORBA

(column 3, lines 50 – 64). CORBA specifies a system, which provides interoperability between objects in a heterogeneous, distributed environment.

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...and including the step of subsequently executing said project definition in response to receipt of a further communication through a communications link.” Fowlow discloses that an Object Request Broker provides transport mechanisms in a distributed system to deliver a communication from a client to a servant object, and invokes an operation on a distributed object (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 18).

In regard to claim 8, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

“...said communication which initiates execution to be sent by respective different users.” Fowlow discloses that an Object Request Broker provides transport mechanisms in a distributed system to deliver a communication from a client to a servant object, and invokes an operation on a distributed object (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 18). A distributed system inherently contains different users.

In regard to claim 9, incorporating the rejection of claim 8:

“...said communication which initiates execution to be sent by respective different communications links.” Fowlow discloses that an Object Request Broker provides transport mechanisms in a distributed system to deliver a communication from a client to a servant object, and invokes an operation on a distributed object (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 18). A distributed system inherently contains different users in different locations with inherently different communications links.

In regard to claim 10, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

“...said communication which initiates execution to be sent through the same communications link.” Fowlow discloses that an Object Request Broker provides transport mechanisms in a distributed system to deliver a communication from a client to a servant object, and invokes an operation on a distributed object (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 18). The Fowlow invention can run on the same machine or process or on different machines (column 4, lines 3 – 5), thus communication can be sent through the same communications link.

In regard to claims 11 – 16, and 18 - 20 (a computer-readable medium), these claims are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 1 – 6, and 8 – 10 (the method).

In regard to claim 21:

Claim 21 adds an additional limitation to the identical preceding limitations of claim 1. *“wherein said preparing step is carried out at said first end of said communications link, and wherein said transmitting step includes the step of including said project definition within said communication transmitted through said communications link.”* Claim 21 is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in claim 1. Fowlow discloses connections links between components causing storing and execution of a definition (described in the interface of the object component; Abstract, e.g., Figures 4 and 5). Also, Fowlow discloses that the system optionally may be coupled to a computer or telecommunications network using a network connection, but does not explicitly disclose transmission of a program causing storing and execution of the program on the second end of the communication link. However, Reger

explicitly discloses a method to download software code through a communication link from a user at a first end to a second end, and the transmission causes automatic storing and execution of the downloaded code in the receiving system (column 5, lines 50 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of preparing a predetermined set of definitions Fowlow with the storing and execution of a program over a communication link as taught by Reger, because the automatic storing and execution of code into a remote system would allow the coupling of the Fowlow system to a network for downloading updates free of human intervention and without the need for technical expertise as taught by Reger in the Abstract.

6. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowlow et al., U.S. Patent 6,083,277 in view of Reger, U.S. Patent 6,643,843, and further in view of Madany et al. U.S. Patent 6,493,870 (hereinafter referred to as Madany).

In regard to claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

“...configuring said communications link...and using a network browser to generate said further communication.” Fowlow discloses a method of providing a set of distinct predetermined function definitions using a browser (column 10, line 63), but does not explicitly teach the use of a web browser. However, Madany discloses a distributed system with a remote execution method in which an execution package is created from a set of components in response to a communication through a communications link that may include the Internet (column 9, lines 27 – 28), the package is stored (in memory for execution) and executed (Abstract; column 5, lines 16 – 41; e.g., Figures 2 and 3). If the Internet is provided as a communications

medium in the Madany invention, then one skilled in the art would expect the use of a web browser to generate communications between remote sites in the distributed system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of preparing the project definition of Fowlow with the Madany invention that stores and executes an application, which is constructed by packaging components, after receiving a communication over a communications link using a web browser over the Internet, because after preparing a project definition in the Fowlow invention it would be logical to execute it, and the Madany invention provides a means to accomplish the storage and execution in response a request over a communications link that includes the Internet.

In regard to claim 17 (a computer-readable medium), this claim is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 7 (the method).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed January 18, 2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection:

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2124

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

March 12, 2004

Kakali Chaki
KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100